

REMARKS

Claims 57-93 are pending in the application. By this Response, claims 57, 61-62, 70, 72, 76-77, 86, 88, and 93 have been amended. The amendments were made as corrections expressly required by the Examiner in the Final Office Action. Such amendments are explicitly authorized under 35 U.S.C. §1.116 and entry is permitted. The Applicants respectfully request that the amended claims be kindly entered. Reconsideration of this application for allowance of all pending claims is hereby respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 52, 72 and 88 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which application regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that claim term “designating”, as it is used in claims 52, 72, and 88, is unclear to the Examiner. To assist the Examiner, the Applicants amended claims 52, 72, and 88 to clarify what is claimed. Claim term “allocating” is now used, whose meaning is commonly understood in the art of computers. Therefore, the amended claims 52, 72, and 88 now have clear meaning and are therefore definite.

Claims 61, 76, and 93 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which application regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that claim limitation “translatable component is one of ... any combination thereof in an electronic data stream” is unclear to the Examiner. To address the Examiner’s concern, the Applicants amended claims 61, 76, and 93. It is believed that the amended claims 61, 76, and 93 clarified the Examiner’s concern and are definite.

Claims 62 and 77 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner stated that claim limitation “text segment”, as recited in claims 62 and 77, has insufficient antecedent basis. To address the Examiner’s concern, the Applicants have

amended claims 62 and 77 and it is believed that the relevant claim term now has sufficient antecedent basis.

Claims 70 and 86 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner stated that claim limitation "a file that is one of the first content ...", as recited in claims 70 and 86, has insufficient antecedent basis. To address the Examiner's concern, the Applicants have amended claims 70 and 86 and it is believed that relevant claim term now has sufficient antecedent basis.

Accordingly, it is believed that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's representative at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Bernard L. Gold (Reg. No. 06,429)
for
Stephen A. Becker
Registration No. 26,527

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 SAB:llg
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: July 13, 2007
WDC99 1421979-1.074869.0015

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**